

Appl. No. : 10/758,774  
Filed : January 16, 2004

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-40 and 83-124 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner maintains that there is not sufficient support for the requirements of coefficient of static fiction of less than 0.900 and the coefficient of kinetic friction of less than 0.800. Claims 1 and 83 have been amended to remove these limitations.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-23, 26-67, 69-107 and 109-124 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure that is not enabling. The Examiner maintains that a binder is critical to the practice of the invention. Claims 1, 41, and 83 have been amended to include the limitation of a binder.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-6, 42-48 and 84-90 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention, because of insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 1, 41, and 83, upon which these claims depend, have been amended to include the limitation of a binder.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

8. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 7-19, 32-37, 41-44, 49-61, 74-79, 83-86, 91-103 and 114-121 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478). Claims 2 and 84 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 41, and 83 have been amended to require cellulosic fibers, thicker thermoplastic fibers of 2 to 6 denier, thermal bonding bicomponent fibers, and binder.

Hayase discloses a cleaning sheet comprising cellulosic fibers, thermoplastic fibers of 9 to 140 denier, heat-fusible fibers of 0.5 to 5 dtex (0.45 to 4.5 denier), and binder. Hayase does not disclose both the combination of thicker thermoplastic fibers of 2 to 6 denier and thermal bonding bicomponent fibers.

Therefore, Hayase does not anticipate Claims 1, 41, and 83. Claims 2, 7-19, and 32-37 are dependent on Claim 1. Therefore, Hayase does not anticipate Claims 2, 7-19, and 32-37.

Accordingly, the objection to Claims 1, 7-19, 32-37, 41-44, 49-61, 74-79, 83, 85-86, 91-103 and 114-121 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

Appl. No. : 10/758,774  
Filed : January 16, 2004

8. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 7-8, 11, 13-15, 18-19, 26-29, 32-37, 41-44, 49-50, 52-53, 55-57, 60-61, 74-79, 83-86, 91-92, 94-95, 97-99, 102-103 and 116-121 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Annis et al. (WO 97/21865). Claims 2 and 84 have been cancelled.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirement of 3-11% latex binder. Annis does not disclose latex binders specifically, but does disclose wet strength agents, and, in particular, a water soluble resin in amounts well less than 2% by weight. (pg 11, lines 6-18 of Annis)

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirement of a substrate that does not comprise nodulated abrasive fiber remnants. Annis requires nodulated abrasive fiber remnants to give the substrate an abrasive quality. Claims 7-8, 11, 13-15, 18-19, 26-29 and 32-37 are dependent on Claim 1.

Claim 41 requires that the ratio of the coefficient of static friction to the coefficient of kinetic of greater than about 1.5. Annis discloses substrates with a ratio of 1.16, 1.17 and 1.12 (pg 18, Table III of Annis). Claims 42-44, 49-50, 52-53, 55-57, 60-61, and 74-79 are dependent on Claim 41.

Claim 83 has been amended to include the requirement of 3-11% binder. Annis does not disclose binders specifically, but does disclose wet strength agents, and, in particular, a water soluble resin in amounts well less than 2% by weight. (pg 11, lines 6-18 of Annis) Claims 85-86, 91-92, 94-95, 97-99, 102-103, and 116-121 are dependent on Claim 83.

Accordingly, the objection to Claims 1, 7-8, 11, 13-15, 18-19, 24-29, 32-37, 41-44, 49-50, 52-53, 55-57, 60-61, 74-79, 83, 85-86, 91-92, 94-95, 97-99, 102-103 and 116-121 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 32-37, 74-79, and 114-121 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478). Claims 32-37 are dependent on amended Claim 1. Claims 74-79 are dependent on amended Claim 41. Claims 114-121 are dependent on amended Claim 83.

Accordingly, the objection to Claims 32-37, 74-79, and 114-121 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

Appl. No. : 10/758,774  
Filed : January 16, 2004

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-6, 45-48, 87-90 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478) in view of Trapasso et al. (US 4,172,173). Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Amended Claims 1, 41, and 83 are unobvious over Hayase as reasoned above. Since Claims 3-6, 45-48, 87-90 are dependent upon Claims 1, 41, and 83, Claims 3-6, 45-48, 87-90 are unobvious over Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478) in view of Trapasso et al. (US 4,172,173).

Accordingly, the objection to Claims 4-6, 45-48, 87-90 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 20-31, 62-73, 104-107, and 109-112 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478) in view of Adams et al. (US 5,811,178).

Amended Claims 1, 41, and 83 are unobvious over Hayase as reasoned above. Since Claims 20-31, 62-73, 104-107, and 109-112 are dependent upon Claims 1, 41, and 83, Claims 20-31, 62-73, 104-107, and 109-112 are unobvious over Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478) in view of Adams et al. (US 5,811,178).

Accordingly, the objection to Claims 20-31, 62-73, 104-107, and 109-112 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 38-40, 80-82, and 122-124 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478) in view of Kilkenny et al. (US 2003/0100465).

Amended Claims 1, 41, and 83 are unobvious over Hayase as reasoned above. Since Claims 38-40, 80-82, and 122-124 are dependent upon Claims 1, 41, and 83, Claims 38-40, 80-82, and 122-124 are unobvious over Hayase et al. (US 2002/0106478) in view of Kilkenny et al. (US 2003/0100465).

Accordingly, the objection to Claims 38-40, 80-82, and 122-124 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Appl. No. : 10/758,774  
Filed : January 16, 2004

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If, however, some issue remains which the Examiner feels may be addressed by Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Please charge any additional fees, including fees for additional extensions of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03 2270.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Clorox Company  
**Customer No. 27019**

Dated: September 19, 2006

By: /David Peterson/  
David Peterson  
Registration No. 37,909  
Attorney of Record  
Tel: (510) 271-7521  
Fax: (510) 271-1652